



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICISMS AND DISCUSSIONS.

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE HEBREW DEITY-NAME EL SHADDAL.

Some time ago my attention was directed to an article written by M. de Jassy, and printed in *The Monist* for January 1908, wherein the writer sets forth the somewhat novel theory that many of the proper names, as well as other words found in the Hebrew Bible, had their origin in the Sanskrit language. I make no pretensions to a knowledge of Sanskrit, but I take it for granted that M. de Jassy is correct in his showing that certain word-forms are alike or similar in Sanskrit and in Hebrew, though there seems to be little to support his theory that Semitic names may be derived from Sanskrit originals. Rather I should say that where these similarities occur they are both derived from a common source, as the Egyptian, or Akkadian. But be that as it may, I shall for the present endeavor to show that our author is mistaken in his derivation of the Hebrew deity-name El Shaddai. M. de Jassy would derive this from the Hebrew *shadad*, "to destroy," and says that *shad* in Sanskrit also means "to destroy," "subdue," "vanquish," etc. After a careful examination of this and similar words in the Hebrew I find nothing to show that there is any connection between *shad* or *shadad*, "to destroy," "spoil," "conquer," and *shad*, "the female breast," aside from the purely accidental one of similarity in form and sound. It would be just as reasonable to suppose a common original for two words which might happen to be alike in our English, as for instance "hail," frozen vapor, and "hail," to call; or "lay," a song, and "lay," to place in a recumbent position. *The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance* shows that *shad*,¹ "the female breast," occurs about twenty times in our Hebrew Bible, while *shadad*,² together with the shorter form³

¹ שָׁדַי

² שָׁדַדַּי

³ שָׁדַי

(pointed to be pronounced *shōd*), "to spoil," "destroy," "vanquish," is found about eighty times. I think it probable that the root of *Shaddai* is to be found in the Egyptian, whence it passed into Hebrew. It occurs forty-eight times in our Hebrew text, and is always rendered "Almighty" in the English translation. In six instances it is preceded by El, and rendered "God Almighty," though "God the Nourisher" or "Provider" would more nearly represent the sense of the original. In Gen. xvii. 1, El Shaddai tells Abram, he will make a covenant with him, and will multiply him exceedingly; in chapter xxviii. 3, Isaac, on the occasion of sending his son Jacob to Padan-aram to find a wife, prays: "El Shaddai bless thee, and make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people"; in chapter xxxv. 11, we are told that God said to Jacob: "I am El Shaddai, be fruitful and multiply; a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come from thy loins," etc. In Gen. xlviii. 3, Jacob, on his deathbed, repeats this last promise of El Shaddai to his son Joseph, and in chapter xlix. 25, the name of Shaddai is invoked as the giver of blessings from the heavens above, the depths beneath, of the breasts and of the womb. See also Gen. xliii. 14, and Ex. vi. 3. Thus the name of Israel's God as El Shaddai is shown to relate chiefly to the maternal function of nursing, and beyond the idea of strength derived from nourishment, potency or power is foreign to the sense of the original. Gerald Massey, in his voluminous work on ancient Egypt, says (*Book of the Beginnings*, Vol. I, p. 6): "The waters of old Nile are a mirror which yet reflects the earliest imagery made vital to the mind of man, as the symbols of his thought. A plant growing out of the waters is an ideograph of *Sha*, a sign and image of primordial cause. . . . the emblem of rootage in the water and breathing in the air, the two truths of all Egypt's teaching. . . ." The form of the Hebrew letter⁴ which has the sound of *sh* proclaims its origin, which is that of plant life, presented in the conventional form so characteristic of early Egyptian art. To further quote Massey (*B. of B.*, Vol. II, p. 161):

"*Sha* in Egyptian denotes all commencement of forms, births, becomings and fertility, the period of the inundation, the substance born of, to make go out, to extract, cease to flow. *Shat* is the "sow," and from the persistence of this type in Israel as the sacred, or the abominable, there can be little doubt that the original symbol of Shaddai, "the suckler," was the *shat*, or *shati*, "the sow," just as

in Britain the sow was a type of the goddess Ked. No picture of the *Dea Multimammæ* could more effectively present the feminine nature of Shaddai than the description of this divinity of Israel in Genesis: "Shaddai, who shall bless thee with blessings of the breasts and of the womb."

If it be true that *shad* is of Egyptian origin it was most likely through the Akkado-Assyrian that it came to the Hebrews, as *sidi* or *sedu* was with the former the name for the month Taurus, when that star-group marked the equinox. The bull or ox was named *gud*, and *gud sidi*, "the propitious Bull," was the opening sign of the spring and summer season. "The word *sidi*, 'to prosper,' is, I think, the origin of the divine name *El Sidi*"^s (Dr. E. G. King, *Akkadian Genesis*, p. 47). When the Aries or Ram cult succeeded that of the Bull, owing to the effects of equinoctial precession, *Gud*, or *Gad*, as type-name of the month, was transferred to that of the Ram, as one of the twelve tribes of Israel, though *sidi*, as Shaddai, continued in the maternal phase to represent *Taurus* and the tribe of Joseph (Ephraim, "the fruitful"). The later Assyrian equivalent of the Akkadian *sidu* is *alap*, hence *Aleph*, "the Ox," and the first letter of the Semitic alphabets, was, some six thousand years ago, under the symbol of the Ox, the opening sign of the year, beginning at the spring equinox. The earliest ideas of divinity seem to have been centered in the female as reproducer, whence the worship was gradually transferred to the male as generator, first in the stellar and lunar, and at last in the solar stage. Then the cast out divinity of one cult became, as frequently occurs in history, the *diabolos* of another, and in Deut. xxxii. 17 we find *shedim* rendered as "devils." "They (*Jeshurun*, meaning Israel) sacrificed unto devils (*shedim*), not unto God (*Eloah*); unto gods (*elohim*) whom they knew not," and in Ps. cvi. 37 we read: "Yea, they (Israel) sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils (*shedim*)." This last would seem to indicate that at some former period Israel was not above offering human sacrifices to their imaginary gods. The deity-name *El Shaddai* always occurs in connection with those of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and is said to have been the only name by which he was known to them (Ex. vi. 3), the name JHVH being made known first of all to Moses at a much later date. This would indicate that the feminine principle was recognized as a factor in the nature of the Hebrew deity at that early period, though it was almost eliminated by the later Biblical writers. For,

אל שרי

though *shad* expresses femininity alone, in the form *Shaddai* the masculine principle also is suggested, the *yad*⁶ (*i*) being regarded by those versed in Hebrew mysticism as the expressor of the male divinity. To quote Laurence Oliphant (*Scientific Religion*, p. 449): "It is a well-known rule of Semitic philology that similar consonants may be interchanged, one with another, this interchange effecting certain modulations in sense. Thus sibilants may be interchanged with sibilants, dentals with dentals, gutturals with gutturals, etc. Now in the case of *shad* we have a soft sibilant, *sh*,⁷ and a soft dental, *d*.⁸ Corresponding to *sh*⁹ we have two hard sibilants,¹⁰ both equivalent to our English *s*. Corresponding to *d*¹¹ we have also two hard dentals¹² rendered by the English *t*, (the latter sometimes modified into *th*.¹³ These sibilants and dentals may be consequently interchanged with each other, the conversion of the soft consonant into the corresponding hard having just this simple but important effect,—it *inverts* the sense, either partly or wholly, according to whether one only or both the consonants are changed. A remarkable illustration of this rule is afforded by the word *shiddah*,¹⁴ "a virtuous wife," and *sittah*,¹⁵ "a wife who has gone astray."

Thus according to Kabbalistic teachings *Shad* represents the feminine nature in a good or legitimate sense, while *Sat*, or *Set*, becomes the type of the cast out divinity, derived by the Hebrews from Egyptian originals. *Set*, *Seth*, or *Sut* became not merely the opponent of the good Osiris but the incarnation of evil after his expulsion from the Egyptian pantheon, as is shown in the typology of *Sothis*, the Dog-star,—the "dog" which let in the universal "flood" by going to sleep when she should have been on watch. Analogous to these word-forms the opponents of the good *Shaddai* become, by the inversion of the first syllable only, the partly wicked *Siddim*, but by the final substitution of *s* and *t* for *sh* and *d*¹⁶ the wholly evil *Set*, amplified at length into *Satan*. As the pure gods of light and life are always depicted as dwelling upon the mountain heights (cf. Jerusalem), so, conversely, the fiends of darkness and evil are consigned to the low, desolate valleys and caverns of the earth. Hence the Hebrew writers represented the barren, rocky region of the Salt Sea, the lowest body of water on the earth, and about the most desolate in its surroundings, situated some twenty miles eastward of Jerusalem, as the abode of the wicked *Siddim*,

⁶ יָד ⁷ שׁ ⁸ דּ ⁹ שׁ ¹⁰ שׁ and ט ¹¹ דּ ¹² ט and ת ¹³ ה ¹⁴ שִׁידָה
¹⁵ שִׁטָּה ¹⁶ That is, the substitution of שׁ and ט for דּ and ת

and the location of their city of Sodom. Shaddai occurs thirty-one times in the book of Job, and this great poem simply sets forth the conflict between the powers of good and evil, led on one side by Shaddai, and on the other by Satan, chief of the *Siddim*.

"As Shaddai is the maternal giver and preserver of life, so Satan, the antagonist, is the destroyer. Hence through the agency of Satan, the cattle, the asses, the flocks, the servants, and the children of Job are destroyed, and he himself is afflicted with suffering just short of death. The patriarch is wrongly tempted to ascribe to Shaddai the actions of Satan, but he finally emerges victorious, until 'the latter end of Job was more blessed than the beginning'" (Oliphant, *Sci. Rel.*, p. 451).

I shall here consider but one other of M. de Jassy's comparisons between Sanskrit and Hebrew,—that of the name *Mizraim*, for Egypt. Says our author (*Monist*, Jan. 1908, p. 128): "Let us now take an example of less importance, the word *Mizraim*, 'Egypt.' Let us remove the plural ending, or rather the dual form, *aim*. We obtain the word *Mizr*. Let us now see what *misr* means in Sanskrit. *Misr*, from *misra*, signifies "combined, united, jointed places." *Misr* in Sanskrit means Egypt (the upper and the lower, hence the dual form in Hebrew). It would be idle to continue here."

But I think it a good idea "to continue here," since the author of the above has barely scratched the ground. "*Misr* in Sanskrit means Egypt," but what does it mean *in Egypt*, or rather in the Nile Valley, since Egypt is a comparatively modern name for this perhaps oldest of all civilized lands? In reply I shall mainly follow Gerald Massey, who perhaps went as deeply into Egyptian originals as any man ever has done. To quote from his *Book of the Beginnings*, Vol. I, p. 4:

"The Assyrians call Egypt *Muzr*. *Muzau* is 'source,' an 'issue of water,' a 'gathering' or 'collecting.' It is the Egyptian *mes*, the 'product of a river.' *Mes* means 'mass,' 'cake,' 'chaos'; it is the product of the waters gathered, engendered, massed. The sign of this mass was the hieroglyphic cake, the Egyptian ideograph for land. This cake of *Mesi* was figured and eaten as their bread of the mass, a seed-cake, too, as the hieroglyphs reveal. And the cake is extant to-day in the wafer still called by the name of the Mass, as it was in Egypt. *Mes*, the 'product of the waters' and the 'cake,' is likewise the name for 'chaos,' the chaos of all mythological beginnings. *Mes* then, the 'mass,' or 'product of the river when

caked,' is the primeval land periodically produced from the waters, —the land of *Mesr*, whether of black mud or red. We find a word in Ethiopic similar to *metzr*, meaning the 'earth,' 'land,' 'soil.' *Mazr*, or *mizr*, is an Arabic name for 'red mud.' There is, however, a mystical reason for this 'red' applied to mud as a synonym of 'source' or 'beginning.' . . . But the Hebrew name of Egypt, *Mitzraim*, applies to both lands. For this we have to go farther than Lower Egypt, and *mes*, the 'product of a river,' the 'mud' of mythology. 'We may rest assured,' says Brugsch Bey, 'that at the basis of the designations *Muzur* (Assyrian), *Mizr* (Arabic), *Mitzraim* (Hebrew), there lies an original form MRS, all explanations of which have as yet been unsuccessful.' His rendering of the meaning as Mazor, the 'fortified land,' the present writer considers the most unsuccessful of all. *Mest-ru* and *Mest-ur* are the Egyptian equivalents for the Hebrew *Mitzr*, plural *Mitzraim*, and the word enters into the name of the Mestrian princes of the old Egyptian Chronicle. *Mest* is the 'birthplace,' literally the 'lying-in-chamber,' the 'lair of the whelp,' while *ru* is the 'gate,' 'door,' 'mouth' or 'outlet'; *ur* is the 'great,' 'oldest,' 'chief.' *Mest-ru* is the 'outlet from the birth-place.' In this sense the plural *Mitzraim* would denote the 'double land of the outlet from the inland birth-place.' . . . 'It is certain, however,' says Feurst, 'that *mtzr*¹⁷ and *mtzur*¹⁸ meant originally and chiefly "the inhabitants."' It is here that *Mest-ur* has the superiority over *Mest-ru*. The *ru* in *mest-ru* adds little to the birth-place, whereas the compound *mest-ur* expresses both the oldest born and the oldest birth-place. The Hebrew letter *tzaddi*¹⁹ represents a hieroglyphic *Tes*, which deposits a phonetic *T* and *S*, hence the permutation; *mtzr* is equated by *mstr*, and both modify into *misr*. In the same way the Hebrew *Matzebah*²⁰ renders the Egyptian *Mastebah*. Also *Mitzraim* is written *Mestraim* by Eupolemus. . . . The Samaritan Pentateuch (in Gen. xxvi. 2) renders *Mitzraim* by the name of *Nephiq*²¹ which denotes the 'birth-land' (*ka*), with the sense of 'issuing forth.' In Egyptian *nefika* would indicate the 'inner land of breath,' 'expulsion,' 'going out,' or it might be the 'country of the sailors.' The name 'Egypt,' Greek *Aiguptos*, is found in Egyptian as *Khebt*, *Khept*, or *Kheft*, meaning the 'lower, or hinder part,' the 'north,' the 'place of emanation,' the 'region of the Great Bear.' The *f*, *p*, and *b* are still extant in *Kuft*, a town in Upper Egypt; in *Coptos*, that is *Khept-her*, or 'Khept above,' when came the *Caphtorim* of the Hebrew writings

¹⁷ מצר ¹⁸ מצור ¹⁹ צ ²⁰ מצבה ²¹ נפיק cf. Aramaic נסך "to go out."

(Gen. x. 14), enumerated among the sons of *Mitzraim*; and in *Kheb*, 'Lower Egypt.'"

There is much more that might be adduced to show the futility of seeking for the roots of Egyptian words in Asiatic languages, but the subject is too large a one for the limits of a single magazine article. The foregoing examples should help some in dispelling the illusion, however, and I may in the near future add some further testimony, should the editor kindly allow me the space.

F. M. BEHYMER.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

THE NATURE AND PERCEPTION OF THINGS.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF THE NEW REALISM.

One of the enduring problems of philosophy is how we perceive physical objects—chairs, houses, men, etc.—and what the nature of these perceived things is. There are two time-honored and familiar explanations of this apparently simple, but really difficult, question. The more ancient and less reflective of these is the doctrine that is known as Common Sense or Naive Realism. This theory maintains, in substantial conformity with the views of the plain man and virtually without analysis, that things exist precisely as they are perceived; that the house that is known as white, square, and as existing at such a point in space *is* white and square, and *does* exist independently of the mind in that portion of space, and that that is all there is of it. It is thus the salient feature of the position that it asserts the identity, at least in cases of true knowledge, of the thing known and the thing existing, and that it regards this identity as a simple and evident fact, requiring little explanation and no defense.

But the slightest reflection shows that the facts of perception are not as simple as this. It is a commonplace, indeed, that things do not always appear as they really are—that, to an observer viewing them under radically different conditions, they present themselves in a rich and confusing variety of garbs. Thus, the house that is white takes on ever deepening shades of gray as night approaches, and appears now in one form, and now in another, according to the angle or distance from which it happens to be viewed. Things as they appear are not one but many, and so cannot